



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

public, in celebration of the amicable settlement of their boundary dispute, had had executed in granite a large statue of the Christ, which they had set up on the border as an evidence of the new spirit in which they proposed henceforth to live in their relations to each other.

Dr. Ames in a few words declared that he had always been optimistic about the good things coming to the world, though these often seemed to him afar off. But he had been greatly encouraged by the events of the year, to which reference had just been made, to believe that they were much nearer than he had sometimes, because of the prevailing evils, supposed them to be.

Edwin D. Mead, speaking of the Peace Congress to be held in Boston in October, pointed out the services to the cause of international peace which had been rendered by Benjamin Franklin, who went from Boston to Philadelphia. He called attention to the fact that the first resolution introduced into a legislative body calling for action similar to that taken by the Czar's conference had been proposed by Samuel Adams, a Boston man. The proposal of peace congresses was first made in Boston, by Joseph Sturge, in 1841, to a group of Boston peace workers, who had met to welcome the English anti-slavery reformer. The New England anti-slavery men were all peace men, and ardent supporters of the cause. Elihu Burritt, a New England man, had been chiefly instrumental in inducing the holding of the first series of peace congresses from 1848 to 1853. Charles Sumner had founded a prize in Harvard College for essays on the best methods of promoting the abolition of war, and another New England man (in the audience) had recently followed the example of Sumner and founded a similar prize in another New England college. Still another New England man, a graduate of Yale (also in the audience), had shown by statistics of the services of Yale men to the country the utter untenableness of the claim of President Roosevelt that West Point had furnished more men who had promoted the good of the country than any other educational institution. Kant, he said, had contributed as much to the advancement of civilization by his "Eternal Peace" as by his "Pure Reason." Pure reason and peace come to about the same thing. The statue of Frederick the Great, of which Mr. MacVeagh had spoken, had on its base images of Kant, Lessing, and other German thinkers. Kant would some day be extended to the top, and Frederick, the warrior, would disappear. Quoting Henry D. Lloyd, whose picture was on the wall behind him, he declared that when a considerable majority of the American people made up their minds that there should be no more war, war would cease. The peace congresses heretofore had had great educational value, and the coming one in Boston, the first week in October, at which many eminent

men from this country and Europe would be present, it was hoped to make one of the most impressive peace demonstrations ever held.

The exercises were closed with a brief speech by Moorfield Story. He said that wars were going out of fashion. They had become too dangerous. There was no "glory" in a dangerous war. France had not been engaged in a serious war for a generation, nor had England for half a century. Italy had had no serious conflict since she became a united nation. Wars against small nations were not, however, going out of fashion. England's "peaceful mission" to Thibet was proof of this, as had been our treatment of the Filipinos. Arbitrations between great nations had come into fashion; he would like to see them come into fashion between the great nations and the small ones. It had been said that we should not arbitrate where our case was clear. Did men refuse to take their cases to the courts when they were clear? We had refused to arbitrate the Alaska boundary dispute because our case was clear, nor had we finally consented to let it go to a commission till we had got one which we were sure would not allow the case to go against us. We had refused to arbitrate with Colombia the question of the proper construction of the treaty of 1846, — a purely judicial question, — because Colombia was a weak power, and the case was *so clearly against us* that we were unwilling to have it go before an impartial tribunal. Alluding to the statue of Frederick the Great, he was sorry, he said, that in the United States the soldier was still the standard. He wished that we might rise to the standard of China even, where the scholar was in higher esteem than the soldier. Washington was full of statues of military heroes. Boston was not quite so bad. But Washington was the school of the country, and that taught the people to regard the soldier higher than scholars and other classes of civilians. He hoped that we might endeavor to bring the standard of the United States up to at least that of China.

---

### Extracts from the Address of Hon. Wayne MacVeagh at the Annual Dinner of the American Peace Society, May 18.

*Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen :*

We are entitled to congratulate ourselves very heartily upon the auspicious anniversary we are celebrating tonight. It is now too clear for doubt that the cause we have at heart, which involves only that moral law upon which the true progress and the true welfare of mankind depend, has marvelously increased in strength and respect and impressiveness since that memorable day five years ago when the Peace Conference assembled at The Hague. The lofty ethical appeal of the Emperor of Russia to all the devotees of war to cease their advocacy

of it was in a true sense epoch-making; for he declared with equal truthfulness and in absolute sincerity that "the maintenance of general peace and a possible reduction of the excessive armaments which weigh upon all nations, present themselves, in the existing condition of the whole world, as the ideal toward which the endeavors of all governments should be directed."

That stalwart blow for international peace and for the reduction instead of the increase of armaments will never cease to resound, in my judgment, until both objects are attained; and the American Peace Society honors itself in observing this anniversary — for seventy-six years ago this Society declared: "We hope to increase and promote the practice already begun of submitting international differences to arbitration."

Now the Peace Conference which assembled at The Hague five years ago carried out the desire expressed by this Society seventy-six ago. It provided distinctly that hereafter all the twenty-six nations which were parties to that Convention, and all of the nations thereafter assenting to it, should, before any war broke out, before any hostilities commenced, endeavor, by the exercise of mediation, by the exercise of good offices, by an appeal to the arbitration this Society so long ago championed, to prevent the outbreak of hostilities between any of the nations parties to that convention, and that no steps toward hostility should be taken until after these three methods of reaching a peaceable solution had been entirely exhausted, and then — in order that no nation should thereafter say, But how shall we arbitrate? — that Conference proceeded further and established a permanent court, providing nearly seventy eminent and distinguished jurists from these twenty-six nations, any one of whom was liable to be asked to sit as a judge in any arbitration which the parties desired to secure. So that there was, after that, no excuse whatever — and there is no excuse whatever now — for any of the nations which were parties to that Conference — and every civilized nation either was a party or subsequently adhered to it — to engage in hostilities without an effort to settle the controversy by arbitration or the other means provided in the convention.

That Convention is a most wise and flexible provision. Any nations having controversies with each other — Japan and Russia, for instance — can in their own way, at their own time, under circumstances and regulations provided wholly by themselves, either select three or five or seven or nine of those jurists, and may assemble them either at The Hague or elsewhere — for The Hague is not mandatory — and in every possible respect they may themselves stipulate when the proceedings shall be begun, what order of procedure shall be observed, how long the proceedings shall continue, and what question or questions shall be transmitted to the tribunal for decision. So that from the day the Conference adjourned, having introduced these new principles into the law of nations, it was the duty — and it is the duty now — of all nations to seek to avoid hostilities, to seek to avoid war, through the good offices or the mediation of nations not interested in the controversy, or, finally, through an arbitration of the questions in dispute. In these ways every possible excuse for going to war was removed, except the innate desire of nations to expand their boundaries at the expense of some other people. That

the Hague Conference could not take out of human nature, and therefore war still exists and probably will continue to exist; but you will see how perfectly easy it is now for any nation really wishing to avoid war to avoid it, and to secure an honorable decision of the controversy whatever its character may be.

There are many other elements which ought greatly to encourage us in prosecuting our labors in the cause of peace. I cannot myself have anything but absolute faith in its final and not very distant triumph; and that for the simple reason, if for no other, that this is God's world, and his laws discouraging war and encouraging peace will ultimately prevail in it. Those laws, making as they always do for righteousness, are indeed even now winning their way, in spite of all obstacles, far more rapidly than was to be expected; for we should never forget that the divine order for the education of the world moves but slowly along its appointed course; but it does move, and always forward. Let us hope that forward movement will soon embrace many who now thoughtlessly allow themselves to support the idea that the needless killing of men is not, after all, very objectionable.

During the short period of a single year the whole face of European politics has been changed from a war-like to a peaceful attitude by the numerous treaties of friendship and arbitration concluded between great nations, and especially by the important treaties between France and England and between France and Italy; while South America has furnished a practical lesson in the reduction of armaments and a confident reliance upon friendly methods of settling whatever international controversies may arise. What Argentina and Chile have so auspiciously begun is sure to be soon followed by the other South American republics; and it will be a curious commentary upon our boasted superiority in Christian civilization if those South American communities put us to open shame by recognizing that peace is nobler than war and that international friendship is a better safeguard of international honor than a great navy, before the country of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln has had the moral courage to act upon such self-evident truths. [Applause.]

In any event, we may rest assured that a discontent with wars of aggression and conquest against the weak by the strong and with their frightful cost alike in blood and treasure is growing in intensity every day, leading to different manifestations in different countries, it is true, but having one common source, an ever-increasing reverence for the moral law. The command, "Thou shalt not steal," is at last being recognized as binding upon nations as well as individuals; and before long the like command, "Thou shalt do no murder," will be recognized as equally binding upon all nations as well as upon all men. The very stars in their courses, my friends, are fighting for the cause these commandments enforce, and its final triumph is as sure as that this solid earth endures. While, therefore, we are only seeking to secure obedience to the laws God has proclaimed for the peaceful progress of all his children, we can well afford to labor and to wait in a cheerful temper and in the confident hope which welcomes all favorable signs and is proof against all discouragement.

In addition to cheerfulness, we need also to cultivate the kindred virtue of charity. It does not follow that

men mean to do evil because their works are evil. You recollect that Motley declares that even the appalling bigotry of Philip the Second was sincere, and that he really believed that he was gaining heaven by making a hell on earth; and while Lord Acton is quite right in insisting that no man and no cause must be allowed to escape the undying penalty which history has the power to inflict on wrong, there is no reason whatever why we should fail to accord to those who differ from us the same sincerity we claim for ourselves. It is indeed quite possible, for instance, that the advocates of war may in sincerity believe themselves to be Christians, while really advocating the tenets of Mohammedanism, which very properly, as it is the exact opposite of Christianity, owed its progress and establishment to the sword.

The truth is that Mohammed is the perfect type of the "war lord"; while war is, as Verestschagin declared, just before starting on his fatal mission to Port Arthur, "the reversal of Christianity." Possibly our bellicose friends, who insist that they are so fond of slaughter that life is unendurable without a constant increase in armament by land and sea to kill possible enemies they must first find or create, would agree to call themselves Mohammedan-Christians. The hyphen might reconcile them to the double appellation, which would be at least half way to the truth.

Then, too, the Mohammedan doctrine of international eminent domain was exactly that of our warlike friends. If Mohammed saw any territory belonging to others which he wished to possess, he seized it by the right of international eminent domain, being compelled, he said, to vindicate by war his claims of supremacy when denied, and to enforce his sovereignty by the sword upon people who were unwilling to accept it; and he also called them "rebels" for wishing to be let alone, just as we do. [Laughter.] He was in every sense, you will find, the historical forerunner of our expansionists [Applause], and we are told that he also took the initiative, "for aggressiveness was in his blood." [Laughter.] That is a literal quotation, and therefore can have no personal application.

Now the Christian doctrine of eminent domain is the exact opposite of the Moslem. It is the beneficent dedication by a sovereign power of certain property of its own subjects to the public welfare, but only upon express condition that the full value of the property taken be determined by an impartial tribunal and promptly paid to the owner. It is a little trying to one's patience to read the arrant nonsense by which it is pretended that such a doctrine affords even a decent pretense for a powerful nation seizing such territory as she covets, without compensation to the real owner, from a nation too weak to offer effectual resistance, and refusing an appeal for an impartial arbitration. Such a seizure is international eminent domain of the Moslem variety pure and simple, the highwayman's plan,

"That he shall take who has the power  
And he shall keep who can."

And it is equally childish and futile to try to disguise it as anything else.

This effort to hide "criminal aggression" under misleading phrases is one of the effects of the creeping paralysis which seems lately to be taming the advocates of aggressive war and expansion by means of war, making

them less and less insistent in their demands. Indeed, they are now even growing apologetic and assure us they are far less terrible than they appear. Many a resounding advocate in Congress and out of it of a greater army and a greater navy, of more constant smelling of gunpowder and more frequent shedding of blood, is really only the paid agent for the sale of armor plate or battleships or provisions for army or navy, or possibly the latest proposed form of waste of public money, the buying of great camps at great and excessive cost for the display of the trappings of war. Now a lobbyist may be a useful person, but he is as far removed as possible from a hero, either on land or water, and yet it is the lobbyist who secured these great sums in preparations for war by a nation which can never be involved in conflict except by its own wanton aggression upon the rights of others.

And there is another recent healthy sign, especially in Washington. It is that our bellicose friends seem to be now ashamed of having accepted a statue of the "war-lord" and expansionist, Frederick the Great. They were proud of it at first, but not now. They deserve our sympathy, for even they recognize, when it is too late, the pitiful incongruity of asking soldiers of America, whose best example in war as in peace is Washington, to mould their lives upon the life of such a ruthless military despot. It is at least to be hoped that the statue, when erected in this country and thus become our exclusive property, will bear two inscriptions; one his own judgment upon himself: "Ambition, interest," he says, "the desire to make people talk about me, carried the day, and I decided for war"; and the other, the judgment of history upon him: "On his head is all the blood which was shed in a war which raged during many years, and in every quarter of the globe, the blood of the column of Fontenoy, the blood of the mountaineers who were slaughtered at Culloden. The evils produced by his wickedness were felt in lands where the name of Prussia was unknown, and in order that he might rob a neighbor whom he had promised to defend, black men fought on the coast of Coromandel, and red men scalped each other by the Great Lakes of North America." With those inscriptions upon it, the statue would be comparatively harmless [Applause], and we wait for the saner day when Congress would order it to be removed, and to be replaced by a statue of some one of the illustrious children of the Fatherland, who have been among the sovereign educators and sovereign benefactors of mankind by helping "to make reason and the will of God prevail." [Applause.]

There is another virtue for us to cherish — the courage of our convictions. We ought to be cheerful, we ought to be charitable, but we must also be brave — brave and free. The question is this: Shall we continue to waste the taxes wrung from labor in preparation for wars of aggression? Congress now presents the unwelcome spectacle of devoting a far greater portion of its time to considerations affecting war directly or indirectly than to any one of the serious and threatening domestic problems which confront the country and demand solution.

It is not at all necessary to believe them guilty of wilful misconduct in acting as they do, nor are they much more to be blamed for doing so than is the general public for acquiescence in such conduct. I do not, however, in

the least undervalue the difficulties of courageous action in such matters. It is so much pleasanter to swim with the stream than against it, so much pleasanter to be in the majority than the minority. As loyal, devoted, patriotic Americans, we owe it to the memory of our fathers and to the free institutions they bequeathed us, not to fail to discharge our duties in these respects. We ought on every proper occasion, individually, if necessary, to serve notice on President and Congress alike that we will not longer submit in silence to an entire perversion of the principles for which the Revolution took place and of the aims and purposes for which our government was founded. For a hundred and twenty years the Republic prospered beyond any poet's dream. It was then a "world power" in the true sense, because it represented to all nations the strength and glory of liberty and peace.

Surely even the most militant person cannot doubt that our present army and navy are more than ample for our defense, as no country in the world is in the least danger of provoking a war with us. It is therefore not unreasonable to ask that the preparations for wars which can never happen, except by our own fault, should cease, and that we should devote ourselves again to our true mission, that of commending by our example free institutions to other nations; and if we have any surplus treasure let us expend it in lightening the expenses and the burdens of those whose days are given to toil and into whose lives enters far too little of brightness and joy.

Above all, we must demand that every controversy in which our country becomes involved must be peaceably settled either by agreement with our adversary or by some form of honorable and impartial arbitration. Even if the controversy is with one of the great powers, though great powers now very seldom go to war with each other, we must insist upon this course; but if the controversy is with a small country incapable of asserting its rights in arms against us,—and it is chiefly against such that great nations now wage war,—it is far more necessary for our honor and our dignity not to use our superior strength to refuse our adversary an appeal to a disinterested tribunal, for such a refusal would be a confession of wrong done to a country incapable of punishing us for committing it, than which nothing could be baser.

One of the consolations of the closing years of life is a sense of fellowship not so much with the spirit of the age as with the spirit of the ages; and in that fellowship we may cherish an unshaken faith that in spite of all abatements

"The world out of night  
Rolls into light."

It may move slowly, but it does move, and in the right direction, for we are learning nobler standards of life, more elevating conceptions of heroism, and more inspiring ideals of civic duty; while we are also learning that the only true patriotism is rooted in reverence for the moral law. To assist, in however slight a degree, in such an advance is a service which brings with it its own abundant compensations, and we ask none other.

Spain and Portugal have followed the example set by the other European countries and signed a treaty of obligatory arbitration, along the lines of the Anglo-French treaty.

## Seventy-Sixth Annual Report of the Directors of the American Peace Society.

*Mr. President and Members of the American Peace Society:*

The Report which we herewith respectfully submit closes the seventy-sixth year of the work of the American Peace Society. Though darkened by the cloud of war in the Far East, the year has been on the whole one of unexampled interest in the cause of international peace and of remarkable progress in the development and organization of the principle of arbitration among the nations.

### DIRECTORS' MEETINGS.

At our Board Meetings, which have been held as usual every two months, the regular lines of our work have been carefully considered, and the important questions of the day related to our movement have been discussed, and we have endeavored to act in relation to them in such a way as most effectively to promote the principles for which the Society stands.

### PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* and the *ANGEL OF PEACE*, our monthly publications, have been continued, and their circulation considerably increased over last year. The monthly edition of the *ADVOCATE* is now five hundred copies larger than at this time in May last. Effort has been made to keep the paper up to a high standard and to make it a live, up-to-date, efficient organ of the great cause of international justice and amity which is now winning its way so rapidly in public favor. The paper has been sent as heretofore gratuitously to college and university reading rooms, theological schools, city libraries, Y. M. C. A. rooms, etc. Generous contributions for this purpose have been received from a number of interested individuals. Besides this, many copies have been subscribed for by members and friends of the Society and sent to those whose interest it was desired to secure. In no recent year has the *ADVOCATE* been more thoroughly appreciated and more widely quoted in other journals. We have reason to believe that the service which it is rendering in the development of right public opinion is continually increasing. The members of the Society everywhere are urged to do whatever they can to promote its wider circulation.

### GENERAL LITERATURE.

The demand for books and pamphlet literature treating of various aspects of the questions of peace and war has been steady throughout the year. The works most called for are Sumner's and Channing's "Discourses on War," Bloch's "Future of War," the Baroness von Suttner's "Lay Down Your Arms," Trueblood's "Federation of the World," and pamphlets and leaflets treating of the growth of arbitration and of the cost and waste of war. Literature has been supplied from our office for a number of debates in colleges, for orations at oratorical contests and college commencements, and for sermons on peace and arbitration. The interest in the subject taken by an increasing number of young men and women in the colleges and universities is one of the most encouraging omens of the time.